arXiv:1208.0881v1 [math-ph] 4 Aug 2012

On Spinors and Null Vectors

Marco Budinich
Dipartimento di Fisica
Università di Trieste & INFN
Via Valerio 2, I - 34127 Trieste, Italy
`mbh@ts.infn.it`
`http://www.ts.infn.it/~mbh/MBHgeneral.html`

August 7, 2012

Abstract

We investigate the relations between null vectors and spinors in Clifford algebra with particular emphasis on the conditions that a spinor must satisfy to be simple (also: pure). In particular we show: i) that each null vector bisects the spinor space; ii) that simple spinors are one-dimensional subspaces of spinor space; iii) a necessary and sufficient condition for a spinor to be simple that generalizes a theorem of Cartan and Chevalley that appears now as a corollary of this result. We also show that the most general spinor with a given associated totally null plane can be written immediately without the need to satisfy any of the so called "constraint relations".

1 Introduction

Spinors were introduced by Élie Cartan [4] some 80 years ago and were later further developed by Claude Chevalley [6] in the mathematical frame of Clifford algebras. The relation between spinors and null (also: isotropic) vectors, pioneered by Cartan, is central and have been visited many times since then, see e.g. [3].

In this paper we will continue the study of this relationship in general $2m$-dimensional space taking advantage from the Extended Fock Basis (EFB) of Clifford algebra introduced in [1] and [2] and briefly resumed in section 2. Section 3 and 4 are respectively dedicated to the vector space V and to the spinor space(s) S of Clifford algebra. In this last section with propositions 12 and 13 we show how one can concisely represent the most general spinor corresponding to any vectorial subspace made entirely of null vectors.

Section 5 contains the main result: a necessary and sufficient condition for a spinor to be simple (also: pure) that is a generalization of previous results and in particular of a theorem due to Cartan [4] and Chevalley [6] that will be derived as a corollary of this result.

For the convenience of the reader we tried to make this paper as elementary and self-contained as possible.

2 The extended Fock basis of Clifford algebra

We start summarizing the essential properties of the EFB introduced in [1] and [2]. We consider Clifford algebras [6] over field F, with an even number of generators $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \ldots, \gamma_{2m}$, a vector space $F^{2m} := V$ and a scalar product g: these are simple algebras of dimension 2^{2m}. As usual

$$g(\gamma_i, \gamma_j) = \frac{1}{2}(\gamma_i\gamma_j + \gamma_j\gamma_i) := \frac{1}{2}\{\gamma_i, \gamma_j\}$$

and we will focus on $F = \mathbb{R}$ with signature $g(\gamma_i, \gamma_j) = \delta_{ij}(-1)^{i+1}$ i.e.

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{lcl} \gamma_{2i-1}^2 & = & 1 \\ \gamma_{2i}^2 & = & -1 \end{array} \right. \qquad i = 1, \ldots, m \tag{1}$$

but results hold with minor changes also if $F = \mathbb{C}$. Given the $\mathbb{R}^{2m}$ signature we indicate the Clifford algebra with $\mathcal{C}\ell_{m,m}(g)$.

A Clifford algebra is the direct sum of its graded parts: field $F := F^{(0)}$, vectors $V := F^{(1)}$ and multivectors $F^{(k)}$, $1 < k \leq 2m$

$$\mathcal{C}\ell_{m,m}(g) = F^{(0)} \oplus F^{(1)} \oplus \cdots \oplus F^{(2m)} \tag{2}$$

and is graded isomorphic to $F(2^m)$, the algebra of matrices of size $2^m \times 2^m$.

The isomorphism (of vector spaces) $\mathcal{C}\ell_{m,m}(g) \cong \Lambda V$ with the Grassmann algebra leads [6] to the following useful formula for the Clifford product $\mu\nu$ of any two elements $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{C}\ell_{m,m}(g)$

$$\mu\nu = \frac{1}{2}\{\mu, \nu\} + \frac{1}{2}[\mu, \nu] := \mu \,\lrcorner\, \nu + \mu \wedge \nu \tag{3}$$

where $\mu \,\lrcorner\, \nu$ represents the *contraction* of μ with ν and $\mu \wedge \nu$ is the *exterior* or *wedge product.*

The null, or Witt, basis of the vector space V is defined:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{lcl} p_i & = & \frac{1}{2}(\gamma_{2i-1} + \gamma_{2i}) \\ q_i & = & \frac{1}{2}(\gamma_{2i-1} - \gamma_{2i}) \end{array} \right. \Rightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{lcl} \gamma_{2i-1} & = & p_i + q_i \\ \gamma_{2i} & = & p_i - q_i \end{array} \right. \qquad i = 1, 2, \ldots, m \tag{4}$$

that, with $\gamma_i\gamma_j = -\gamma_j\gamma_i$, easily gives

$$\{p_i, p_j\} = \{q_i, q_j\} = 0 \qquad \{p_i, q_j\} = \delta_{ij} \tag{5}$$

that imply $p_i^2 = q_i^2 = 0$, at the origin of the name "*null*" given to these vectors.

The EFB of $\mathcal{C}\ell_{m,m}(g)$ is given by the 2^{2m} sequences

$$\psi_1 \psi_2 \cdots \psi_m := \Psi \qquad \psi_i \in \{q_i p_i, p_i q_i, p_i, q_i\} \qquad i = 1, \ldots, m \tag{6}$$

and we will reserve Ψ for EFB elements. The main characteristics of EFB is that all its elements are *simple* spinors, namely elements of the minimal left ideals of Clifford algebra.

The EFB essentially extends to the entire algebra the Fock basis [3] of its spinor spaces and, making explicit the construction $\mathcal{C}\ell_{m,m}(g) \cong \overset{m}{\otimes} \mathcal{C}\ell_{1,1}(g)$, allows to prove in $\mathcal{C}\ell_{1,1}(g)$ many properties of $\mathcal{C}\ell_{m,m}(g)$ [1].

2.1 $h-$ and $g-$signatures

We start observing that $\gamma_{2i-1}\gamma_{2i} = q_i p_i - p_i q_i := [q_i, p_i]$ and that for $i \neq j$ $[q_i, p_i]\,\psi_j = \psi_j\,[q_i, p_i]$. With (5) and (6) it's easy to calculate

$$[q_i, p_i]\,\psi_i = h_i \psi_i \qquad h_i = \begin{cases} +1 & \text{iff } \psi_i = q_i p_i \text{ or } q_i \\ -1 & \text{iff } \psi_i = p_i q_i \text{ or } p_i \end{cases} \tag{7}$$

and the value of h_i depends on the first null vector appearing in ψ_i. We have thus proved that $[q_i, p_i]\,\Psi = h_i \Psi$. In EFB the identity $\mathbb{1}$ and the volume element Γ have similar expressions:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{1} &:= \{q_1, p_1\}\{q_2, p_2\} \cdots \{q_m, p_m\} \\ \Gamma &:= \gamma_1 \gamma_2 \cdots \gamma_{2m} = [q_1, p_1][q_2, p_2] \cdots [q_m, p_m] \end{aligned}$$

with which

$$\Gamma \Psi = \eta\ \Psi \qquad \eta := \prod_{i=1}^{m} h_i = \pm 1 \ .$$

Each EFB element Ψ has thus an "$h-$signature" that is a vector $(h_1, h_2, \ldots, h_m) \in \{\pm 1\}^m$ and clearly $\eta = \prod_{i=1}^{m} h_i$ where we call helicity[2] the eigenvalue η. Similarly the "$g-$signature" of an EFB element is the vector $(g_1, g_2, \ldots, g_m) \in$

---

[1] A technical remark: whereas it's customary to see Clifford algebra as a direct sum of its graded parts (2), these parts are no easily separable in EFB where all elements are multivectors with grade between m and $2m$. Consequently whereas the notation $\gamma_{2i-1}^2 = 1$ is imprecise but usually acceptable, in EFB (5) appears difficult to digest since in EFB there are no field elements.

In EFB $\mathbb{1} = \{q_1, p_1\}\{q_2, p_2\} \cdots \{q_m, p_m\}$ that agrees with $\mathrm{Tr}(\mathbb{1}) = 2^m = \mathrm{Tr}\left(\gamma_{2i-1}^2\right)$ and in EFB $\mathrm{Tr}(\{q_i, p_i\}) = \mathrm{Tr}(\{q_1, p_1\}\{q_2, p_2\} \cdots \{q_m, p_m\}) = 2^m$. On the other hand $\mathrm{Tr}(p_i q_i) = 2^{m-1}$ and the trace of one of the 2^m EFB Ψ elements forming the expansion of $\{q_1, p_1\}\{q_2, p_2\} \cdots \{q_m, p_m\}$ has $\mathrm{Tr}(\Psi) = 1$ and they represent primitive idempotents. All in all we will accept to trade precision for clarity and we will omit the identity symbol $\mathbb{1}$ where it would be formally needed and also omit unnecessary terms $\{p_i, q_i\} = 1$.

[2] chirality could appear more appropriate but helicity is adopted to follow [3]

$\{\pm 1\}^m$ where g_i is the parity of ψ_i under the main algebra automorphism $\gamma_i \to -\gamma_i$. With this definition and with (7) we can easily derive that

$$\psi_i \left[q_i, p_i\right] = g_i \left[q_i, p_i\right] \psi_i = h_i g_i \psi_i \tag{8}$$

and thus

$$\Psi \, \Gamma = \eta\theta \; \Psi \qquad \eta\theta = \pm 1 \qquad \theta := \prod_{i=1}^{m} g_i \tag{9}$$

where the eigenvalue $\eta\theta$ is composed by the helicity and by θ, the global parity of the EFB element under the main algebra automorphism. We can resume saying that all EFB elements are not only Weyl eigenvectors, i.e. right eigenvectors of Γ, but also its left eigenvectors with respective eigenvalues η and $\eta\theta = \prod_{i=1}^{m} h_i g_i$.

2.2 EFB formalism

$h-$ and $g-$signatures play a crucial role in this description of $\mathcal{C}\ell_{m,m}(g)$: first of all one easily sees that any EFB element $\Psi = \psi_1 \psi_2 \cdots \psi_m$ is uniquely identified by its $h-$ and $g-$signatures: h_i determines the first null vector (q_i or p_i) appearing in ψ_i and g_i determines if ψ_i is even or odd.

It can be shown [2] that $\mathcal{C}\ell_{m,m}(g)$, as a vectorial space, is the direct sum of its 2^m subspaces of:

- different $h-$signatures or:
- different $g-$signatures or:
- different $h \circ g-$signatures (where $h \circ g$ is the Hadamard (entrywise) product of $h-$ and $g-$signatures vectors).

We can thus uniquely identify each of the 2^{2m} EFB elements with two "indices". Since different $h \circ g-$signatures will identify different spinor spaces, that we will indicate with $S_{h \circ g}$, it is convenient to choose respectively the $h-$signature and the $h \circ g-$signature i.e.

$$\Psi_{ab} \left\{ \begin{array}{lll} a \in \{\pm 1\}^m & \text{is the} & h-\text{signature} \\ b \in \{\pm 1\}^m & \text{is the} & h \circ g - \text{signature} \end{array} \right.$$

so that the generic element of $\mu \in \mathcal{C}\ell_{m,m}(g)$ can be written as $\mu = \sum_{ab} \xi_{ab} \Psi_{ab}$ with $\xi_{ab} \in F$. With this choice of the indexes one can prove [2] that:

$$\Psi_{ab} \Psi_{cd} = \pm \delta_{bc} \Psi_{ad} \tag{10}$$

where δ_{bc} is 1 if and only if the two signatures b and c are equal with which one can calculate the generic Clifford product

$$\mu\nu = \left(\sum_{ab} \xi_{ab} \Psi_{ab} \right) \left(\sum_{cd} \zeta_{cd} \Psi_{cd} \right) = \sum_{ef} \rho_{ef} \Psi_{ef}$$

where, with (10), one easily finds that

$$\rho_{ef} = \sum_c s(c,e,f)\xi_{ec}\zeta_{cf} \qquad s(c,e,f) = \pm 1$$

where the sign $s(c,e,f)$, quite tedious to calculate, depends on the indexes; in [2] is shown how it can be calculated with matrix isomorphism.

This property shows also that EFB elements map directly to the isomorphic matrix algebra $F(2^m)$ where a and b are respectively the row and column indexes of Ψ_{ab} when interpreted as binary numbers with: $1 \to 0$ and $-1 \to 1$. Calling $e := (1,1,1,\ldots,1) \in \{\pm 1\}^m$ than e represents 0 and $-e$, $2^m - 1$, further details in [2].

3 Vector space V

With the Witt basis (4) it's easy to see that the null vectors $\{p_i\}$ can build subspaces made only of null vectors that we call Totally Null Planes (TNP, also: isotropic planes) of dimensions at maximum m [4]. Moreover the vector space V is easily seen to be the direct sum of two of these maximal TNP P and Q respectively:

$$V = P \oplus Q \qquad \left\{ \begin{array}{lcl} P & := & \mathrm{Span}\,(p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_m) \\ Q & := & \mathrm{Span}\,(q_1, q_2, \ldots, q_m) \end{array} \right.$$

since $P \cap Q = \{0\}$ each vector $v \in V$ may be expressed in the form $v = \sum_{i=1}^{m} (\alpha_i p_i + \beta_i q_i)$ with $\alpha_i, \beta_i \in F$. Using (5) it's easy to derive the anticommutator of two generic vectors v and $u = \sum_{i=1}^{m} (\gamma_i p_i + \delta_i q_i)$

$$\{v, u\} = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \alpha_i \delta_i + \beta_i \gamma_i \quad \in F \tag{11}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2}\{v, v\} = v^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \alpha_i \beta_i \quad \in F \ .$$

We define

$$V_0 = \{v \in V : v^2 = 0\} \qquad V_1 = \{v \in V : v^2 \neq 0\}$$

clearly $V = V_0 \cup V_1$ but neither V_0 nor V_1 are subspaces of V how it's simple to see. Nevertheless V_0 contains subspaces of dimension m, e.g. Q, and, similarly, V_1 contains subspaces of dimension m, e.g. $\mathrm{Span}\,(\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_{2k-1}, \ldots, \gamma_{2m-1})$. Since a set cannot have dimensions lower than those of one of its proper subsets we deduce $|V_0| = |V_1| = |V|/2 = m$.

Proposition 1. *Given any nonzero $v \in V$, there exist nonzero spinor $\omega \in S$ such that $v\omega = 0$ if, and only if, $v^2 = 0$.*

Proof. For any nonzero vector $v \in V_0$ we can take any $\omega \in S$, then either $v\omega = 0$ and ω is the spinor we search, or $v\omega \neq 0$, but then, since S is a left ideal we have $\omega' := v\omega \in S$ and it's non zero and $v\omega' = 0$. Conversely for any v such that $v\omega = 0$ it follows $v^2\omega = 0$ but since $v^2 \in F$ and $\omega \neq 0$ necessarily $v^2 = 0$. □

Corollary 2. *For any $v \in V_1$ and any nonzero $\omega \in S$ it follows $v\omega \neq 0$ (and $v\omega \in S$).*

Proof. This is a consequence of S being a left ideal and of previous proposition but we strengthen the result showing that given any v with $v^2 \neq 0$ the existence of an hypothetical $\omega \in S$ such that $v\omega = 0$ would lead to a contradiction. Let's suppose such ω exists, from $v\omega = 0$ we can deduce $v^2\omega = 0$ and, since $v^2 \neq 0$ this would imply $\omega = 0$. □

3.1 Conjugation in V

We define now the conjugation in vector space V obtained exchanging the field coefficients of p_i with those of q_i i.e. given $v \in V$

$$v = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \alpha_i p_i + \beta_i q_i \quad \Rightarrow \quad \bar{v} = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \beta_i p_i + \alpha_i q_i$$[3]

and this conjugation defines an involutive automorphism on V since $\bar{\bar{v}} = v$.

Let's define the Pin(g) group element $\Delta = (p_1 + q_1) \cdots (p_m + q_m) = \gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_{2k-1} \cdots \gamma_{2m-1}$; it's easy to see with (1) that $\Delta^2 = (-1)^{\frac{m(m-1)}{2}}$ with which we can prove that

$$\bar{v} = (-1)^{\frac{(m-1)(m+2)}{2}} \Delta \, v \, \Delta \ \ .$$

Starting from

$$\Delta \, v \, \Delta = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \alpha_i \Delta \, p_i \, \Delta + \beta_i \Delta \, q_i \, \Delta$$

and, since $(p_i + q_i)p_i(p_i + q_i) = q_i$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \, p_i \, \Delta &= (p_1 + q_1) \cdots (p_m + q_m) \, p_i \, (p_1 + q_1) \cdots (p_m + q_m) = \\ &= (-1)^{\frac{m(m-1)}{2}} (p_m + q_m) \cdots (p_1 + q_1) \, p_i \, (p_1 + q_1) \cdots (p_m + q_m) = \\ &= (-1)^{\frac{m(m-1)}{2}} (-1)^{m-1} q_i = (-1)^{\frac{(m-1)(m+2)}{2}} q_i \end{aligned}$$

---

[3] for $F = \mathbb{C}$ then $\bar{v} = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \bar{\beta}_i p_i + \bar{\alpha}_i q_i$

and similarly $\Delta\, q_i\, \Delta = (-1)^{\frac{(m-1)(m+2)}{2}} p_i$ so that the proposition is proved. Again

$$\bar{\bar{v}} = \Delta\Delta\, v\, \Delta\Delta = v$$

and it's also simple to see that $v^2 = \bar{v}^2$ since

$$\bar{v}^2 = \Delta\, v\, \Delta\Delta\, v\, \Delta = (-1)^{\frac{m(m-1)}{2}} \Delta\, v^2\, \Delta = v^2 \quad . \tag{12}$$

Proposition 3. *Given nonzero* $v \in V_0$ *and* $\omega \in S$ *such that* $v\omega = 0$ *it follows* $\bar{v}\omega \neq 0$*, conversely* $\bar{v}\omega = 0$ *implies* $v\omega \neq 0$*.*

Proof. We start showing that $(v + \bar{v})^2 > 0$; with (12) and (11)

$$(v + \bar{v})^2 = \{v, \bar{v}\} = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \alpha_i^2 + \beta_i^2 > 0 \qquad \text{i.e.} \qquad \{v, \bar{v}\} \in F^{+}\,[4]$$

and then, by corollary 2, $(v + \bar{v})\omega \neq 0$ that, if one of the terms is zero, implies that the other must be non zero. ☐

We remark that this result is just an implication holding only when one of the two terms is zero since there are cases in which both terms are non zero, e.g. $v = p_1$, $\omega = q_1 q_2 \cdots q_m + p_1 q_1 q_2 \cdots q_m$.

3.2 Totally Null Planes again

We prove here some technical propositions needed in the sequel.

Proposition 4. *Given* $k \leq m$ *nonzero vectors* $v_i \in V$*, they form a TNP if, and only if,* $\{v_i, v_j\} = 0$ *for any* $1 \leq i, j \leq k$*.*

Proof. Since the vectors have to be all null this implies $v_i^2 = 0 = \{v_i, v_i\}$ and since any of their linear combinations have to be as well null this implies $\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k} \alpha_i v_i\right)^2 = \sum_{i>j} \alpha_i \alpha_j \{v_i, v_j\} = 0$ and since this must hold for any α_i this implies $\{v_i, v_j\} = 0$ for any i, j. The converse is immediate. ☐

It follows by (3) that for two vectors forming a TNP $v_1 v_2 = v_1 \wedge v_2$. This easily generalizes for k vectors to $v_1 v_2 \cdots v_k = v_1 \wedge v_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge v_k$ that, for the property of the external product, proves:

Corollary 5. *Given* $k \leq m$ *nonzero vectors* $v_i \in V$ *forming a TNP, the dimension of the TNP is* k *if, and only if,* $v_1 v_2 \cdots v_k \neq 0$*.*

Proposition 6. *Given* $k - 1 < m$ *nonzero vectors that form a TNP of dimension* $k - 1$*, a* k*-th null vector can be added to them to form a TNP of dimension* k *if, and only if, neither* v_k *nor* $\bar{v}_k$ *are in Span*$(v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{k-1})$*.*

---

[4] note that also $(v - \bar{v})^2 = -\{v, \bar{v}\} < 0$

Proof. That necessarily $v_k \notin \mathrm{Span}\,(v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{k-1})$ is fairly obvious; to show that also $\bar{v}_k$ must not be in $\mathrm{Span}\,(v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{k-1})$ let's suppose the contrary, i.e. $\bar{v}_k = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i v_i$, then since $0 \neq \{v_k, \bar{v}_k\} = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i \{v_k, v_i\}$ and thus $\{v_k, v_i\} \neq 0$ for some i and thus v_k cannot form a TNP with $v_1 v_2 \cdots v_{k-1}$. The converse is immediate. □

4 Spinor spaces

We have seen that $\mathcal{C}\ell_{m,m}(g)$, as a vectorial space, is the direct sum of subspaces of different $h \circ g-$signatures. Given the Clifford product properties (10) these subspaces are also minimal left ideals of $\mathcal{C}\ell_{m,m}(g)$ and thus coincide with 2^m different spinor spaces $S_{h\circ g}$ that in turn correspond to different columns of the isomorphic matrix algebra $F(2^m)$. Each of the 2^m spinor spaces admits a faithful and irreducible representation of $\mathcal{C}\ell_{m,m}(g)$ and since the algebra is simple there exist isomorphisms interwining the representations. This subject certainly deserves deeper investigations also in view that multiple spin spaces $S_{h\circ g}$ have been proposed for mirror particles [7] and one should thus explore the possible physical implications of (9).

We choose the spinor space with $h \circ g = -e$ so that when we speak of a generic S we refer to the particular spinor space S_{-e} used to build the Fock basis [3]. Its generic element is described by: $\omega = \sum_a \xi_{ab} \Psi_{ab}$ and, since the second index of the $h \circ g-$signature is constant we will omit it, writing for the spinor expansion in the Fock base

$$\omega \in S \qquad \omega = \sum_a \xi_a \Psi_a \quad . \tag{13}$$

Here we are interested mainly in the relations between spinors and TNP and we will try to investigate them independently of the particular base.

Spinors are known to be isomorphic to TNP [3] and for each spinor $\omega \in S$ we define its corresponding TNP as:

$$M(\omega) := \{v \in V : v\omega = 0 \text{ and } \{v_i, v_j\} = 0 \quad \forall v_i, v_j \in M(\omega)\}$$

and the spinor is *simple* iff the TNP is of maximal dimensions, i.e. iff $|M(\omega)| = m$; clearly $M(\omega)$ is a vectorial subspace of V_0.

Since all EFB elements are simple spinors each of them has an associated TNP of maximal dimension uniquely identified by the $h-$signature a of Ψ_a; for example if $a = (-1, 1, 1, \ldots, 1)$ then $\Psi_a := \Psi_{(-1,1,1,\ldots,1)} = p_1 q_1 q_2 \cdots q_m$ and $M(\Psi_a) = \mathrm{Span}\,(p_1, q_2, \ldots, q_m)$.

We remark that Δ defines an automorphism also in spinor space S; since Δ is an element of the $\mathrm{Pin}\,(g)$ group its action on $\omega \in S$ is given by $\Delta\omega$ and since

$$\begin{aligned} (p_i + q_i) q_i &= p_i q_i \\ (p_i + q_i) p_i q_i &= q_i \end{aligned}$$

i.e. multiplication by $(p_i + q_i)$ has the effect of inverting both h and g signatures, the effect on a spinor $\omega \in S$ is to invert the h-signature leaving the spinor in its initial spinor space. Thus given any $\omega \in S$ we define

$$\bar{\omega} := \Delta\omega = \Delta \sum_a \xi_a \Psi_a = \sum_a s(a)\xi_a \Psi_{-a} \qquad s(a) = \pm 1$$

where $s(a)$ is a sign (quite intricate to calculate explicitly); obviously $\bar{\bar{\omega}} = \Delta^2\omega = (-1)^{\frac{m(m-1)}{2}}\omega$ that shows that this automorphism is involutive when $m \equiv 0, 1 \pmod 4$.

Proposition 7. *For any nonzero $v \in V_0$, given $\omega \in S$ such that $v\omega = 0$ it follows $v\bar{\omega} \neq 0$, conversely $v\bar{\omega} = 0$ implies $v\omega \neq 0$.*

Proof. By propositions 3 we know that $v\omega = 0$ implies $\bar{v}\omega \neq 0$ and

$$\bar{v}\omega = (-1)^{\frac{(m-1)(m+2)}{2}} \Delta\, v\, \Delta\omega = (-1)^{\frac{(m-1)(m+2)}{2}} \Delta\, v\bar{\omega} \neq 0$$

being S a left ideal $\Delta\, v\bar{\omega} \in S$ and, by corollary 2, we can left multiply it by any non-zero vector and it remains non zero. I.e. we can left multiply previous relation by $(-1)^{\frac{(m-1)(m+2)+m(m-1)}{2}}\Delta$ and we get $v\bar{\omega} \neq 0$. With a similar procedure from $v\bar{\omega} = 0$ we have $\bar{v}\bar{\omega} \neq 0$ and from this $v\omega \neq 0$. □

4.1 The "generic" spinor Φ

Given the spinor expansion (13) we call Φ

$$\Phi := \sum_a \xi_a \Psi_a \tag{14}$$

the "generic" spinor of S with the understanding that the field coefficients ξ_a are taken as "undeterminated" i.e. that they are free to take any value; varying the coefficients Φ spans the entire S so we will abuse the notation and write $\Phi = S$.

This variability of the coefficients is a critical point: as a rule of thumb one can say that varying the values of the field coefficients doesn't alter the properties of a spinor *as long as* they are different from zero. We explain this with two examples: let $\omega := v\Phi \neq 0$ where v is a null vector; obviously $v\omega = v^2\Phi = 0$ and this happens for any choice of the coefficients ξ_a in Φ showing that, at least as far as these properties of the spinor are concerned, the particular values of the coefficients can be irrelevant. To show that 0 is a critical value we consider another example in $\mathcal{C}\ell_{2,2}(g)$: let us take $\omega = \xi_1 p_1 q_1 q_2 + \xi_3 p_1 q_1 p_2 q_2$; it's simple to see that $v = p_1$ is the only vector such that $v\omega = 0$ and this is true for any value of the coefficients ξ_1, ξ_3. But if $\xi_1 = 0$ then another null vector annihilates ω since $p_1\omega = p_2\omega = 0$, similarly if $\xi_3 = 0$ then $p_1\omega = q_2\omega = 0$. These examples show that we are moving along a treacherous path and that one must proceed with some care.

Proposition 8. *For any nonzero $v \in V_0$ $v\Phi \neq 0$ provided Φ has all 2^m terms of (14) nonzero.*

Proof. Given any nonzero $v \in V_0$ it's always possible to find $\omega \in S$ such that $v\omega \neq 0$. Take any ω, if $v\omega \neq 0$ we are done, if instead $v\omega = 0$ then take $\bar{\omega}$ since by proposition 7 $v\bar{\omega} \neq 0$. So in any case there are value of the coefficients ξ_a of (14) to get $v\Phi \neq 0$.

In the appendix we show that the hypothesis is strict, i.e. that is sufficient that for just one index a, $\xi_a = 0$ to be able to find $v \in V_0$ such that $v\Phi = 0$. □

Since there are no null vectors $v \in V_0$ such that $v\Phi = 0$ and only $0\Phi = 0$ we can assume

$$M(\Phi) = \{0\} \qquad \text{and} \qquad |M(\Phi)| = 0$$

and this completes the picture of correspondences between V_0 and S: any null vector v identifies the annihilating spinors (see an explicit construction in the proof of proposition 1). Conversely almost any spinor annihilates one or more null vectors, an exception is Φ but later on we will show it's not the only one.

Proposition 9. *Any nonzero $v \in V_0$ partitions the spinor space S into two subsets: $S_v = \{\omega \in S : v\omega = 0\}$ and $\bar{S}_v = \{\omega \in S : v\omega \neq 0\}$ so that for any v we can write $S = S_v \cup \bar{S}_v$; moreover $|S_v| = |\bar{S}_v| = 2^{m-1}$.*

Proof. We start showing that S_v and $\bar{S}_v$ are both non empty: in the proof of proposition 8 we saw how, given any nonzero $v \in V_0$, one can always find $\omega \in \bar{S}_v$. With this ω we can build $\omega' := v\omega \neq 0$ that clearly is in S_v.

To prove the statement about sizes we start observing that given any $\omega \in S$ it's either in S_v or in $\bar{S}_v$ and we will prove that for any ω in one subset there exists a "twin" spinor ω', linearly independent from ω, that belongs to the other subset. Let's suppose first $\omega \in S_v$ then, by proposition 3, $\omega' := \bar{v}\omega \neq 0$ and since $\bar{v}\omega' = \bar{v}^2\omega = 0$ by the same proposition $v\omega' \neq 0$ and thus $\omega' \in \bar{S}_v$. Moreover ω' is clearly linearly independent from ω since the hypothesis $\omega = \alpha\omega'$ leads to contradictions. If the initial spinor ω is in $\bar{S}_v$ then $\omega' := v\omega \neq 0$ and $v\omega' = v^2\omega = 0$ and thus $\omega' \in S_v$ and is linearly independent from ω. Thus since given every spinor lying in one subset there exists a linearly independent twin in the other subset we can deduce that $|S_v| = |\bar{S}_v|$ and since, necessarily, $|S_v| + |\bar{S}_v| = |S| = 2^m$ both sizes must be 2^{m-1}. □

We remark that while S_v is a vectorial subspace of S, $\bar{S}_v$ is not a subspace: consider again an example in $\mathcal{C}\ell_{2,2}(g)$: $v = p_1 + q_2$ and $\Psi_0 = q_1 q_2$, $\Psi_3 = p_1 q_1 p_2 q_2$. Clearly $v^2 = 0$ and $v\Psi_0 = v\Psi_3 = p_1 q_1 q_2$ but $v(\Psi_0 - \Psi_3) = 0$. We remark also that $\bar{S}_v$ is different from $S_{\bar{v}} = \{\omega \in S : \bar{v}\omega = 0\}$ since a spinor such that $v\omega \neq 0$ and $\bar{v}\omega \neq 0$ belongs to $\bar{S}_v$ but not to $S_{\bar{v}}$, moreover $S_{\bar{v}}$ is a subspace.

Before proving the next proposition we introduce the notation $v\Phi$ where v is a nonzero vector of V_0 and Φ is the generic spinor (14). Consider for example $v = q_i$, when we calculate $v\Phi$ all the terms of the expansion (14) in which $h_i = 1$ (i.e. those $\Psi_a = \cdots q_i \cdots$) are immediately set to 0 independently of the values of the coefficients ξ_a. So with $q_i\Phi$ we indicate the generic spinor with $h_i = 1$, i.e. a spinor with only half of the elements of the Fock basis. So in general with $v\Phi$ we mean the generic spinor whose components have "survived" to the multiplication by v. In the following proposition we show that this property of halving the spinor space spanned by Φ does not depend on the particular choice $v = q_i$ but is general.

Proposition 10. *Given nonzero $v \in V_0$ the subset $v\Phi$ coincide with S_v, i.e. one can write $S_v = v\Phi$.*

Proof. We start showing that for any $\omega \in S_v$ there exists $\omega^* \in \bar{S}_v$ such that $\omega = v\omega^*$. In previous proof we saw that $\omega' := \bar{v}\omega \neq 0$ is such that $v\omega' \neq 0$ and

$$v\omega' = v\bar{v}\omega = \{v, \bar{v}\}\,\omega = \alpha\omega$$

where $\alpha = \{v, \bar{v}\} \in F^+$ by hypothesis. So to get our initial ω it's sufficient to set the coefficients ξ_a of (14) to get $\Phi = \omega^* = \alpha^{-1}\omega' = \alpha^{-1}\bar{v}\omega$ so that $v\Phi = \omega$. Since this procedure works for any $\omega \in S_v$ we have thus proved that the set $v\Phi$ can reach any $\omega \in S_v$ and thus that $S_v \subseteq v\Phi$. On the other hand for any $\omega \in v\Phi$ one has $v\omega = v^2\Phi = 0$ and thus $S_v = v\Phi$. □

This means that the most general spinor that annihilates $v \in V_0$ can always be written, for an appropriate choice of the coefficients ξ_a, as $v\Phi$. From the two previous proposition follows immediately:

Corollary 11. $|v\Phi| = |S_v| = 2^{m-1}$

that generalizes the result, mentioned before, that the sum (14), restricted to terms $v\Phi$, spans a 2^{m-1}-dimensional space.

We are now ready to generalize this result to the case of several null vectors; with obvious notation:

Proposition 12. *Given $k \leq m$ nonzero $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_k \in V_0$ forming a TNP of dimension k, the generic spinor that annihilates $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_k$ can be written $v_1 v_2 \cdots v_k \Phi$, i.e. one can write $S_{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_k} = v_1 v_2 \cdots v_k \Phi$ and $|S_{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_k}| = 2^{m-k}$.*

Proof. The proposition have already been proven in the case of $k = 1$ in proposition 10, so we proceed with an induction step and suppose that for $k-1$ any spinor annihilating $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{k-1}$ may be written by an appropriate choice of the coefficients ξ_a in (14) from $v_1 v_2 \cdots v_{k-1}\Phi$ and thus $S_{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{k-1}} = v_1 v_2 \cdots v_{k-1}\Phi$ and $|S_{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{k-1}}| = 2^{m-k+1}$.

Let us suppose that our k vectors $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_k$ form a basis of the TNP obeying the standard relations (5):

$$\{v_i, v_j\} = \{\bar{v}_i, \bar{v}_j\} = 0 \qquad \{v_i, \bar{v}_j\} = \delta_{ij} \qquad 1 \leq i, j \leq k$$

that can always be obtained by a proper rotation in $\mathrm{Span}\,(v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_k)$ since the vectors are linearly independent by hypothesis. We will show in the next proposition that this hypothesis is by no way a limitation.

Let's now take any $\omega \in S_{v_1,v_2,\ldots,v_k}$, clearly $v_k\omega = 0$ but, by proposition 3, $\omega' := \bar{v}_k\omega \neq 0$, from which $\bar{v}_k\omega' = 0$ from which $v_k\omega' \neq 0$. But, since $\{v_i, \bar{v}_k\} = 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k-1$ it follows that $v_i\omega' = v_i\bar{v}_k\omega = -\bar{v}_k v_i\omega = 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k-1$ and thus $\omega' \in S_{v_1,v_2,\ldots,v_{k-1}}$ and thus, by induction hypothesis, for appropriate coefficients ξ_a, we have $\omega' = v_1 v_2 \cdots v_{k-1}\Phi$.

We know $v_k\omega' \neq 0$ and that $\{v_k, \bar{v}_k\} = 1$ thus

$$v_k\omega' = v_k\bar{v}_k\omega = \{v_k, \bar{v}_k\}\,\omega = \omega$$

and since ω' is already written in the form $v_1 v_2 \cdots v_{k-1}\Phi$ we derive that also any $\omega \in S_{v_1,v_2,\ldots,v_k}$ may be written as $\omega = v_k\omega' = v_k v_1 v_2 \cdots v_{k-1}\Phi = (-1)^{k-1} v_1 v_2 \cdots v_{k-1} v_k\Phi$ since $\{v_i, v_k\} = 0$ for any $1 \leq i \leq k-1$. Thus $S_{v_1,v_2,\ldots,v_k} \subseteq v_1 v_2 \cdots v_k\Phi$ and since any $\omega \in v_1 v_2 \cdots v_k\Phi$ is necessarily also in $S_{v_1,v_2,\ldots,v_k}$ it follows $S_{v_1,v_2,\ldots,v_k} = v_1 v_2 \cdots v_k\Phi$.

To prove the statement about the size one can use the previous argument of the twin spinors to show that in $S_{v_1,v_2,\ldots,v_{k-1}}$ there are two subsets of spinors of equal size: one annihilates v_k and the other annihilates $\bar{v}_k$ and since their sum has size 2^{m-k+1} it follows that the first subset, i.e. $S_{v_1,v_2,\ldots,v_k}$, has size 2^{m-k}. $\square$

An immediate consequence of this result is that any simple spinor $\omega \in S$ may be written as $\omega = v_1 v_2 \cdots v_m\Phi$ where $\mathrm{Span}\,(v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_m) = M(\omega)$, $S_{v_1,v_2,\ldots,v_m} = v_1 v_2 \cdots v_m\Phi$ and $|S_{v_1,v_2,\ldots,v_m}| = 1$, i.e. all simple spinors form one-dimensional subspaces of S.

We show now that the choice of the null vectors $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_k$ used to define $\omega := v_1 v_2 \cdots v_k\Phi$ is completely free provided they define the very same $M(\omega)$.

Proposition 13. *The generic spinor $\omega := v_1 v_2 \cdots v_k\Phi$ with $M(\omega) = \mathrm{Span}\,(v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_k)$, changes only by a multiplicative constant if the defining vectors are changed to $v'_1, v'_2, \ldots, v'_k$ spanning the same $M(\omega)$. The multiplicative constant is the determinant of the matrix A transforming v_i to v'_i.*

Proof. Given a proper linear transformation A changing v_i to v'_i it's easy to see that

$$\omega' := v'_1 v'_2 \cdots v'_k\Phi = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k} a_{1i}v_i\right)\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k} a_{2i}v_i\right)\cdots\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k} a_{ki}v_i\right)\Phi$$

and expanding the product of sums it's clear that all the terms involving powers greater than 1 of any v_i are zero since all the vectors v_i are null. It follows that of the initial k^k terms in ω' survive only the $k!$ terms of the form $v_{\pi_1} v_{\pi_2} \cdots v_{\pi_k}$ where $(\pi_1, \pi_2, \ldots, \pi_k)$ is a permutation of $(1, 2, \ldots, k)$. Given that $v_i v_j = -v_j v_i$ for any $i \neq j$ it follows that all the terms can be brought to the form $\pm v_1 v_2 \cdots v_k$. We conclude showing that actually

$$\omega' = v_1' v_2' \cdots v_k' \Phi = \det A \, v_1 v_2 \cdots v_k \Phi = \det A \, \omega \quad .$$

We proceed by induction: for $k = 2$ we have

$$\omega' = v_1' v_2' \Phi = (a_{11} v_1 + a_{12} v_2)(a_{21} v_1 + a_{22} v_2)\Phi = (a_{11} a_{22} - a_{12} a_{21}) v_1 v_2 \Phi = \det A \, \omega$$

the induction step follows easily from simple determinant properties. □

With these last two propositions we can generalize the concept of generic spinor (14) from Φ, the generic spinor with $M(\Phi) = \{0\}$, to $\omega := v_1 v_2 \cdots v_k \Phi$ that is the generic spinor having $M(\omega) = \mathrm{Span}\,(v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_k)$; moreover the choice of the null vectors $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_k$ used to define $\omega := v_1 v_2 \cdots v_k \Phi$ is completely free.

4.2 The inner product $\langle B\cdot, \cdot \rangle$ of spinor spaces

We use now these results to give different proofs of some known results and to prove some new ones but we start with a concise summary.

The transposed generators (endomorphisms) γ_i^t admit a representation of $\mathcal{C}\ell_{m,m}(g)$ in S^*, the dual of S. Since $\mathcal{C}\ell_{m,m}(g)$ is simple, there is an isomorphism $B : S \to S^*$ interwining the representations (see [3] and [5])

$$\gamma_i^t B = B \gamma_i \qquad \text{and} \qquad B^t = (-1)^{\frac{m(m-1)}{2}} B \quad . \tag{15}$$

The isomorphism B defines also an inner product ($\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ represents the bilinear product)

$$S \times S \to F \qquad B(\omega, \varphi) := \langle B\omega, \varphi \rangle \in F$$

which is invariant with respect to the action of the group $\mathrm{Pin}\,(g)$ made of unit vectors i.e. vectors v such that $v^2 = 1$, namely:

$$B(v\omega, v\varphi) = \langle Bv\omega, v\varphi \rangle = \langle v^t B\omega, v\varphi \rangle = \langle B\omega, v^2 \varphi \rangle = B(\omega, \varphi) \quad .$$

We start with a technical proposition:

Proposition 14. *For any nonzero spinor* $\omega \in S$ *we have* $B(\Phi, \omega) \neq 0$ *(and* $B(\omega, \Phi) \neq 0$*).*

Proof. Since B is an isomorphism the associate inner product is not degenerate: given any nonzero $\omega \in S$ there must exist at least one $\varphi \in S$ such that $B(\varphi, \omega) \neq 0$. Thus, given any nonzero $\omega \in S$, there exist coefficients ξ_a in (14) such that $\Phi = \varphi$ and $B(\Phi, \omega) \neq 0$. □

We now have the instruments to generalize the proposition III.2.4 of [6] eliminating the request of spinors being simple, while, at the same time, giving a simpler proof:

Proposition 15. *For any nonzero spinors $\omega, \varphi \in S$ then $B(\omega, \varphi) = 0$ if, and only if, $M(\omega) \cap M(\varphi) \neq \{0\}$ i.e. $|M(\omega) \cap M(\varphi)| > 0$.*

Proof. Let's suppose first $M(\omega) \cap M(\varphi) \neq \{0\}$ and $v \in M(\omega) \cap M(\varphi)$, then $v\omega = v\varphi = 0$. Let's "normalize" v such that $\{v, \bar{v}\} = 1$, then,

$$\langle B\omega, \varphi \rangle = \langle B\omega, \{v, \bar{v}\}\, \varphi \rangle = \langle B\omega, v\bar{v}\varphi \rangle = \langle v^t B\omega, \bar{v}\varphi \rangle = \langle Bv\omega, \bar{v}\varphi \rangle = 0 \ .$$

To prove the converse let's suppose $B(\omega, \varphi) = 0$ and $M(\omega) = \operatorname{Span}(v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_k)$, $M(\varphi) = \operatorname{Span}(u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_l)$, with proposition 12 we can write

$$\omega = v_1 v_2 \cdots v_k \Phi \qquad \varphi = u_1 u_2 \cdots u_l \Phi$$

and thus using (15)

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \langle B\omega, \varphi \rangle = \langle Bv_1 v_2 \cdots v_k \Phi, u_1 u_2 \cdots u_l \Phi \rangle = \langle v_1^t v_2^t \cdots v_k^t B\Phi, u_1 u_2 \cdots u_l \Phi \rangle \\ &= \langle B\Phi, v_k \cdots v_2 v_1\ u_1 u_2 \cdots u_l \Phi \rangle \end{aligned}$$

and by proposition 14 it follows that, necessarily, $v_k \cdots v_2 v_1\ u_1 u_2 \cdots u_l = 0$. Given the initial hypothesis on the TNP we have with (3)

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= v_k \cdots v_2 v_1\ u_1 u_2 \cdots u_l = (v_k \wedge \cdots \wedge v_2 \wedge v_1)\ (u_1 \wedge u_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge u_l) = \\ &= (v_k \wedge \cdots \wedge v_1) \lrcorner (u_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge u_l) + v_k \wedge \cdots \wedge v_1 \wedge u_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge u_l \end{aligned}$$

and to be 0 both terms must be 0 so that $v_k \wedge \cdots \wedge v_1 \wedge u_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge u_l = 0$ that proves that the set of vectors $(v_k, \ldots, v_1, u_1, \ldots, u_l)$ is not linearly independent and thus that $|M(\omega) \cap M(\varphi)| > 0$. □

Obviously then $B(\omega, \varphi) \neq 0$ if, and only if, $M(\omega) \cap M(\varphi) = \{0\}$ i.e. $|M(\omega) \cap M(\varphi)| = 0$. A less trivial consequence is:

Corollary 16. *Given a nonzero spinor $\omega \in S$ with $M(\omega) = \{0\}$ then $B(\omega, \varphi) \neq 0$ for any nonzero $\varphi \in S$*

and it may come as a surprise that Φ is not the only spinor without a TNP, consider for example $\omega = q_1 q_2 q_3 q_4 + p_1 q_1 p_2 q_2 p_3 q_3 p_4 q_4$ in $\mathcal{C}\ell_{4,4}(g)$, it's easy to check that $v\omega = 0$ only iff $v = 0$ and thus that $M(\omega) = \{0\}$.

5 Simple spinors

We start remembering that the endomorphisms of S, $\mathrm{End}_F S$, provide the representations of $\mathcal{C}\ell_{m,m}(g)$ and with the canonical isomorphism $\mathrm{End}_F S \cong S \otimes S^*$ any $\mu \in \mathcal{C}\ell_{m,m}(g)$ can be written as $\mu \cong \omega \otimes \varphi^*$ for $\omega, \varphi \in S$ and it's action on any spinor $\phi \in S$ is given by

$$\mu(\phi) = \omega \otimes \varphi^*(\phi) := \langle \varphi^*, \phi \rangle \omega = \langle B\varphi, \phi \rangle \omega$$

and since any element of $\mathcal{C}\ell_{m,m}(g)$ can be expressed in the standard multivector expansion

$$\mu \cong \omega \otimes \varphi^* = \sum_{k=0}^{2m} \sum_{\underline{k}} \xi_{\underline{k}} \gamma_{i_1} \gamma_{i_2} \cdots \gamma_{i_k} \qquad \xi_{\underline{k}} \in F$$

where the sum over multiindex $\underline{k}$ indicates the sum over k non decreasing indexes $1 \leq i_1 \leq i_2 \leq \cdots \leq i_k \leq 2m$ and contains $\begin{pmatrix} 2m \\ k \end{pmatrix}$ terms. One easily shows that [3]

$$\xi_{\underline{k}} = \frac{1}{2^m} \langle B\varphi, \gamma^{i_k} \cdots \gamma^{i_2} \gamma^{i_1} \omega \rangle$$

where $\gamma^i = (-1)^{i+1} \gamma_i$ so that $\frac{1}{2} \left\{ \gamma^i, \gamma_j \right\} = \delta^i_j$, and at the end,

$$\mu \cong \omega \otimes \varphi^* = \frac{1}{2^m} \sum_{k=0}^{2m} \sum_{\underline{k}} \langle B\varphi, \gamma^{i_k} \cdots \gamma^{i_2} \gamma^{i_1} \omega \rangle \gamma_{i_1} \gamma_{i_2} \cdots \gamma_{i_k} \quad . \tag{16}$$

Any $\mu \in \mathcal{C}\ell_{m,m}(g)$ can be also be expanded in other bases, for example the EFB, but we won't go into this here leaving it for a future paper.

The multivector expansion (16) remains obviously valid whichever the basis of V, e.g. replacing the γ_i with the Witt basis (4). To ease this passage we write $\gamma_{i_1} \gamma_{i_2} \cdots \gamma_{i_k}$ in the Witt basis. Clearly it's enough to replace each γ using (4) but it's worth noting that each γ appears in $\gamma_{i_1} \gamma_{i_2} \cdots \gamma_{i_k}$ either "single", e.g. like γ_1 in $\gamma_1 \gamma_4 \cdots$, or "married" i.e. in couples like $\gamma_{2i-1} \gamma_{2i}$. With (4) it's easily seen that each "single" γ can be written as $p_i \pm q_i$ and the sign depends on the parity of the index of the corresponding γ, whereas for each "married" couple we saw already that $\gamma_{2i-1} \gamma_{2i} = [q_i, p_i]$ so that, at the end

$$\gamma_{i_1} \gamma_{i_2} \cdots \gamma_{i_k} = (p_{i_1} \pm q_{i_1}) \cdots (p_{i_l} \pm q_{i_l}) \left[q_{j_1}, p_{j_1} \right] \cdots \left[q_{j_r}, p_{j_r} \right] \tag{17}$$

where we have shifted all the commutators at the right (since they commute with all other elements) and where l is the number of the singles and clearly $l + 2r = k$ and $0 \leq l \leq \min(m, k)$. Clearly each of these terms expand in a sum of exactly 2^k terms. We remark also that the expansion of the commutators $[q_j, p_j]$ can originate only from precisely one multivector $\gamma_{i_1}\gamma_{i_2}\cdots\gamma_{i_k}$, i.e. each multivector determines uniquely the married couples. On the other hand each of the 2^l terms of the expansion of the single γ can be produced by 2^l different multivectors $\gamma_{i_1}\gamma_{i_2}\cdots\gamma_{i_k}$ since each single γ can have an even or odd index e.g. p_1p_2 comes from $\gamma_1\gamma_3, \gamma_1\gamma_4, \gamma_2\gamma_3$ and $\gamma_2\gamma_4$.

We now prove a proposition that allows to calculate the field coefficients $\langle B\cdot, \cdot\rangle$ of the expansion (16) with the single γ in the Witt base.

Proposition 17. *The field coefficient of the term* $x_{i_1}\cdots x_{i_l}\,[q_{j_1}, p_{j_1}]\cdots[q_{j_r}, p_{j_r}]$ *of the expansion (16) expressed in the Witt base where:*

$$x_i = q_i \quad \text{or} \quad p_i$$

is given by $\pm 2^{l-m}\langle B\varphi, \bar{x}_{i_l}\cdots\bar{x}_{i_1}\,[q_{j_r}, p_{j_r}]\cdots[q_{j_1}, p_{j_1}]\,\omega\rangle$ *where* $\bar{x}_i$ *is the conjugate of* x_i*.*

Proof. With the multivector expansion and (17) one can write

$$\omega\otimes\varphi^* = \sum_{k=0}^{2m}\sum_{\underline{k}}\xi_{\underline{k}}\gamma_{i_1}\gamma_{i_2}\cdots\gamma_{i_k} = \sum_{k=0}^{2m}\sum_{\underline{k}}\xi_{\underline{k}}(p_{i_1}\pm q_{i_1})\cdots(p_{i_h}\pm q_{i_h})\,[q_{j_1}, p_{j_1}]\cdots[q_{j_s}, p_{j_s}]$$

and left multiplying both sides by $\bar{x}_{i_l}\cdots\bar{x}_{i_1}\,[q_{j_r}, p_{j_r}]\cdots[q_{j_1}, p_{j_1}]$ and taking the trace we have respectively:

$$\mathrm{Tr}\,(\bar{x}_{i_l}\cdots\bar{x}_{i_1}\,[q_{j_r}, p_{j_r}]\cdots[q_{j_1}, p_{j_1}]\,\omega\otimes\varphi^*) = \langle B\varphi, \bar{x}_{i_l}\cdots\bar{x}_{i_1}\,[q_{j_r}, p_{j_r}]\cdots[q_{j_1}, p_{j_1}]\,\omega\rangle$$

and

$$\sum_{k=0}^{2m}\sum_{\underline{k}}\xi_{\underline{k}}\mathrm{Tr}\,(\bar{x}_{i_l}\cdots\bar{x}_{i_1}\,[q_{j_r}, p_{j_r}]\cdots[q_{j_1}, p_{j_1}]\,(p_{i_1}\pm q_{i_1})\cdots(p_{i_h}\pm q_{i_h})\,[q_{j_1}, p_{j_1}]\cdots[q_{j_s}, p_{j_s}])$$

and in calculating the product we remark that $\bar{x}_i(p_i \pm q_i) = \pm\bar{x}_i x_i$ and $[q_j, p_j]\,[q_j, p_j] = 1$. Moreover any trace containing in the product any single p_i or q_i or any $[q_j, p_j]$ is null and with (7) and (8) we can derive that the trace is not null if and only if $l = h$ and $r = s$ and any $\bar{x}_i$ has its corresponding $(p_i \pm q_i)$ and any $[q_j, p_j]$ appears two times so that it squares at 1. We derive

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{Tr}\,(\bar{x}_{i_l}\cdots\bar{x}_{i_1}\,[q_{j_1}, p_{j_1}]\cdots[q_{j_r}, p_{j_r}]\,(p_{i_1}\pm q_{i_1})\cdots(p_{i_l}\pm q_{i_l})\,[q_{j_1}, p_{j_1}]\cdots[q_{j_r}, p_{j_r}]) = \\ &\qquad = \mathrm{Tr}\,(\bar{x}_{i_l}\cdots\bar{x}_{i_1}(p_{i_1}\pm q_{i_1})\cdots(p_{i_l}\pm q_{i_l})) = \pm\mathrm{Tr}\,(\bar{x}_{i_l}x_{i_l}\cdots\bar{x}_{i_1}x_{i_1}) = \pm 2^{m-l}\end{aligned}$$

and thus the thesis. □

With this proposition it's easy to give a simple proof to the following theorem due to Cartan [4] and Chevalley [6] but we will omit it in view of the fact that the successive theorem has a similar proof and that derives this one as a corollary.

Theorem 1. *A nonzero spinor $\omega \in S$ is simple with $M(\omega) = Span(q_1, q_2, \dots, q_m)$ if, and only if, the multivector expansion (16) of $\omega \otimes \omega^*$ contains just the term $q_1 q_2 \cdots q_m$ i.e.*

$$\omega \otimes \omega^* = \xi q_1 q_2 \cdots q_m \qquad \xi \in F \ .$$

Up to now this has been the main theorem used to define a generic simple spinor and its application bring to the so called *constraint relations*. Let's suppose one wants a generic simple spinor ω. By known results one can prove [3] that $B(\omega, \gamma^{i_k} \cdots \gamma^{i_2}\gamma^{i_1}\omega) = 0$ for $m - k \equiv 1, 2, 3 \pmod 4$ so that to apply this theorem one needs to impose $B(\omega, \gamma^{i_k} \cdots \gamma^{i_2}\gamma^{i_1}\omega) = 0$ for $m - k \equiv 0 \pmod 4$ and for $k < m$ (for Hodge duality, see [3]). This implies a number of constraints of the order of $\begin{pmatrix} 2m \\ m-4 \end{pmatrix}$ that grows exponentially with m. For example for $m = 8$ one has to satisfy 1821 constraint relations: one $B(\omega, \omega) = 0$ and $\begin{pmatrix} 16 \\ 4 \end{pmatrix} = 1820$ constraints $B(\omega, \gamma^{i_4}\gamma^{i_3}\gamma^{i_2}\gamma^{i_1}\omega) = 0$.

We are now ready to generalize the theorem 1 of Cartan and Chevalley from a condition on $\omega \otimes \omega^*$ to one for $\omega \otimes \varphi^*$ *for any* $\varphi \in S$ that constitutes the main result of this work.

Theorem 2. *A nonzero spinor $\omega \in S$ is simple with $M(\omega) = Span(q_1, q_2, \dots, q_m)$ if, and only if, for any $\varphi \in S$*

$$\omega \otimes \varphi^* = \sum_{k=k_m}^{m} \sum_{\underline{k}} \xi_{\underline{k}} q_{i_1} q_{i_2} \cdots q_{i_k}$$

where $k_m := |M(\omega) \cap M(\varphi)|$. Moreover it's sufficient to prove the relation for just one of the values $k_m \le k \le m$ to deduce that ω is simple.

Proof. First of all we remark that there is no loss of generality in assuming $M(\omega) = \mathrm{Span}(q_1, q_2, \dots, q_m)$ since, by proposition 13, we know that $q_1 q_2 \cdots q_m \propto v_1 v_2 \cdots v_m$ if v_i span the same TNP and so it's easy to adapt the theorem to any maximal TNP in any base.

We start proving a weaker version with $k_m \equiv 0$ for any $\varphi \in S$. Let's suppose first that ω is simple with $M(\omega) = \mathrm{Span}(q_1, q_2, \dots, q_m)$, for the field coefficients $\langle B\cdot, \cdot\rangle$ of the multivector expansion (16) of $\omega \otimes \varphi^*$ we have, with $\gamma^i = (-1)^{i+1}\gamma_i$ and with (17),

$$\langle B\varphi, \gamma^{i_k} \cdots \gamma^{i_2}\gamma^{i_1}\omega\rangle = \pm\langle B\varphi, (p_{i_l} \pm q_{i_l}) \cdots (p_{i_1} \pm q_{i_1}) \left[q_{j_r}, p_{j_r}\right] \cdots \left[q_{j_1}, p_{j_1}\right] \omega\rangle$$

and given the hypothesis, ω is necessarily an eigenvector of all $[q_{j_s}, p_{j_s}]$ that thus disappear leaving behind just a ± 1. Moreover since $(p_{i_s} \pm q_{i_s})\omega = p_{i_s}\omega$ we can conclude that

$$\langle B\varphi, \gamma^{i_k} \cdots \gamma^{i_2}\gamma^{i_1}\omega\rangle = \pm\langle B\varphi, p_{i_l} \cdots p_{i_2} p_{i_1}\omega\rangle$$

where l is the number of "single" γ's in $\gamma^{i_k} \cdots \gamma^{i_2}\gamma^{i_1}$. At this point applying proposition 17 we have proven the first part of the theorem.

To prove the converse we remark, always by proposition 17, that terms of the form $q_{i_1}q_{i_2}\cdots q_{i_k}$ must have coefficients $\langle B\varphi, p_{i_k}\cdots p_{i_2}p_{i_1}\omega\rangle \neq 0$ that implies $p_{i_k}\cdots p_{i_2}p_{i_1}\omega \neq 0$, that in turn implies $M(\omega) \cap \text{Span}\,(p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_m) = \{0\}$. Viceversa we know by hypothesis that all terms containing p_i in the multivector expansion are zero, that implies that, for any $\varphi \in S$, $\langle B\varphi, q_i\omega\rangle = 0$. Since the inner product is not degenerate, $\langle B\varphi, q_i\omega\rangle = 0$ for any $\varphi \in S$ implies $q_i\omega = 0$ i.e. $q_i \in M(\omega)$ since $\omega \neq 0$ by hypothesis. Since this procedure can be repeated for any q_i we have $M(\omega) = \text{Span}\,(q_1, q_2, \ldots, q_m)$ from which descends the thesis.

To sharpen this result showing that the expansion of $\omega \otimes \varphi^*$ can only contain terms with $k \geq k_m$ we note that by proposition 15 $\langle B\varphi, p_{i_l}\cdots p_{i_2}p_{i_1}\omega\rangle \neq 0$ if, and only if, $M(p_{i_l}\cdots p_{i_2}p_{i_1}\omega) \cap M(\varphi) = \{0\}$. But we know that $|M(\omega) \cap M(\varphi)| = k_m$ so it follows that to have a non zero term necessarily $l \geq k_m$ p_i must be there to "shadow" the k_m q_i that belong to $M(\omega) \cap M(\varphi)$ and thus necessarily $k \geq l \geq k_m$.

We remark that the procedure can be restricted to a particular value of k and the proof remains valid. For example for $k = 1$ we can prove the theorem in V, deduce that ω is simple and derive the result for all other values of k. $\square$

It is clear that choosing $\varphi = \omega$ then $k_m = m$ and we obtain as a corollary the theorem 1 of Cartan and Chevalley. Moreover the case $k = 1$ of this theorem is proposition 7 of [3].

6 Conclusions

We have seen that propositions 12 and 13 allow to write explicitly the most general spinor corresponding to any vectorial subspace made entirely of null vectors.

Moreover we saw that if one wants to define a generic simple spinor, independently from its TNP, one must satisfy an exponential number of constraint relations. On the other hand, if one specifies the TNP, e.g. $\text{Span}\,(q_1, q_2, \ldots, q_m)$ then the definition of the corresponding simple spinor ω is straightforward with quoted propositions or with theorem 2.

Acknowledgments

I warmly acknowledge my father Paolo for the many stimulating discussions and for transmitting me his enthusiasm for simple spinors.

Appendix

Here we show with an example that if just one of the coefficients of the generic spinor (14) is zero, e.g. $\xi_a = 0$, then there exists $v \in V_0$ such that $v\Phi = 0$ and thus that the hypothesis of all non zero coefficients in proposition 8 is strictly needed.

We will proceed bottom up, i.e. we start from $v \in V_0$ with which we build $\omega' := v\Phi \neq 0$ and, clearly, $v\omega' = v^2\Phi = 0$. Then we show that ω' has necessarily just one coefficient zero and that all others can be non zero.

Let's take $v = \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i$ that clearly is in V_0, then

$$\omega' := v\Phi = \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i\Phi \neq 0$$

and we start observing that for any i the spinor $p_i\Phi$ does not contain the component $\Psi_0 = q_1 q_2 \cdots q_m$ since in $p_i\Phi$ the term $p_i\xi_0\Psi_0$ gives

$$p_i\xi_0\Psi_0 = (-1)^{i-1}\xi_0 q_1 q_2 \cdots p_i q_i \cdots q_m$$

and it's also easy to show that $p_i\xi_a\Psi_a \neq \xi_a\Psi_0$ for any a and thus we can conclude that the component Ψ_0 doesn't appear in ω'.

We show now that all the other components of ω' can be non zero and we start observing that each $p_i\Phi$ is made by a sum of terms that have all the 2^{m-1} $h-$ signatures with $h_i = -1$, in other words in each $p_i\Phi$ only the i-th part of the h-signature is "freezed" at $h_i = -1$. But when we calculate the sum $\sum_{i=1}^{m} p_i\Phi$ all 2^m h-signatures different from Ψ_0 will be represented. A given h signature can appear in $1, 2, \ldots, m$ of the elements $p_i\Phi$; for example the signature $(-1, 1, 1, \ldots, 1)$ comes only from $p_1\Phi$ and in particular from $p_1\xi_0\Psi_0$ while $-e$ comes from all the m terms $p_i\Phi$ and will thus have as field coefficient a sum of m different coefficients ξ of Φ. We remark that each of the components has a sum of all different field coefficients, e.g. if a given component Ψ_a appears both in $p_i\Phi$ and in $p_j\Phi$ it will come from different components of Φ and thus the coefficients of Ψ_a in ω' is a sum of different coefficients of Φ. If we want $\omega' = v\Phi$ to have all components represented it's sufficient to choose the initial 2^m coefficients of Φ to take values $2^0, 2^1, \ldots, 2^{2^m-1}$ because any signed sum of any subset of $1, 2, \ldots, m$ of these numbers can never be zero.

So we have built an example showing that, even with just one of the 2^m components of Φ set to zero, Ψ_0 in this case, there exists a null vector that annihilates it.

References

[1] Marco Budinich. On Computational Complexity of Clifford Algebra. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 50(5):053514, May 2009. arXiv:0904.0417v1 [math-ph] 2 April 2009.

[2] Marco Budinich. The extended fock basis of clifford algebra. *Advances in Applied Clifford Algebras*, 22(2):283–296, 2012.

[3] Paolo Budinich and Andrzej Mariusz Trautman. Fock space description of simple spinors. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 30(9):2125–2131, Sep 1989.

[4] Élie Cartan. *The Theory of Spinors*. Hermann, Paris, 1966. first edition: 1938 in French.

[5] Kenneth M. Case. Biquadratic spinor identities. *Physical Review*, 97:810–823, Feb 1955.

[6] Claude C. Chevalley. *Algebraic Theory of Spinors*. Columbia University Press, New York, 1954.

[7] Matej Pavšič. Space Inversion of Spinors Revisited: A Possible Explanation of Chiral Behavior in Weak Interactions. *Physics Letters B*, 692(3):212–217, May 2010.